



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

|                               |             |                      |                     |                  |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.               | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/771,294                    | 02/05/2004  | Masaru Izawa         | 12014-0010DV        | 3231             |
| 22502                         | 7590        | 03/23/2010           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| CLARK & BRODY                 |             |                      | ZHENG, LOIS L       |                  |
| 1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 510 |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| Alexandria, VA 22314          |             |                      | 1793                |                  |
| MAIL DATE                     |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 03/23/2010                    |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***

**Application No.**

10/771,294

**Applicant(s)**

IZAWA ET AL.

**Examiner**

LOIS ZHENG

**Art Unit**

1793

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 8-11, 24 and 25

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
 See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Roy King/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's argument regarding the amended ratio of total acid to free acid of 6 to 11 is not convincing because Boulos teaches a total acid range of 4 to 50(col. 6 lines 13-19) and a free acid range of -1.5 to 1.5(col. 6 lines 29-34). Therefore, the ratio of total acid to free acid in the coating solution of Boulos could range from 2.67(i.e. 4/1.5) to 33.33(i.e. 50/1.5), which encompasses the claimed total to free acid ratio range of 6 to 11. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. See MPEP 2144.05. The examiner maintains that the rejection is proper absent applicant's persuasive evidence demonstrating the criticality of claimed total to free acid ratio of 6 to 11. In addition, the instant invention do not claim free acid number, only recites total acid number and ratio of total acid to free acid.

Applicant further argues that Boulos does not realize the importance of the presence of potassium ions in a Cr containing steel surface treatment(i.e. to improve resistance to galling). The examiner does not find applicant's argument persuasive because it is well settled that *prima facie* obviousness is not rebutted by merely recognizing additional advantages present in the prior art. See MPEP 2145. In this case applicant's recognition of additional advantage due to the presence of potassium ion, such as to improve resistance to galling, does not render the instant invention non-obvious since Boulos teaches the presence of potassium to control the acidity of the treatment solution. The presence of potassium ions in the treatment solution of Boulos would have inherently improved resistance to galling.

Applicant further argues that Boulos only shows using sodium hydroxide in its examples, not potassium hydroxide. The examiner does not find applicant's argument convincing because the examples are merely embodiments of Boulos and do not limit the scope of Boulos' invention, which also includes the addition of potassium hydroxide.